

## COPYRIGHT NOTICE



**FedUni ResearchOnline**  
**<http://researchonline.federation.edu.au>**

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in  
Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies on 06/02/2016, available online:

<http://doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2016.1141868>

# PROOF COVER SHEET

---

Author(s): Debbie Rodan

Article title: Doing animal welfare activism everyday: questions of identity

Article no: CCON 1141868

Enclosures: 1) Query sheet  
2) Article proofs

---

Dear Author,

Please find attached the proofs for your article.

**1. Please check these proofs carefully.** It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to check these and approve or amend them. A second proof is not normally provided. Taylor & Francis cannot be held responsible for uncorrected errors, even if introduced during the production process. Once your corrections have been added to the article, it will be considered ready for publication

Please limit changes at this stage to the correction of errors. You should not make trivial changes, improve prose style, add new material, or delete existing material at this stage. You may be charged if your corrections are excessive (we would not expect corrections to exceed 30 changes).

For detailed guidance on how to check your proofs, please paste this address into a new browser window: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/checkingproofs.asp>


Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can comment on the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat. If you wish to do this, please save the file to your hard disk first. For further information on marking corrections using Acrobat, please paste this address into a new browser window: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/acrobat.asp>

---

**2. Please review the table of contributors below and confirm that the first and last names are structured correctly and that the authors are listed in the correct order of contribution.** This check is to ensure that your names will appear correctly online and when the article is indexed.

Sequence	Prefix	Given name(s)	Surname	Suffix
1		Debbie	Rodan	
2		Jane	Mummery	

Queries are marked in the margins of the proofs, and you can also click the hyperlinks below.

Content changes made during copy-editing are shown as tracked changes. Inserted text is in **red font** and revisions have a **blue** indicator . Changes can also be viewed using the list comments function. To correct the proofs, you should insert or delete text following the instructions below, but **do not add comments to the existing tracked changes**.

## AUTHOR QUERIES

### General points:

1. **Permissions:** You have warranted that you have secured the necessary written permission from the appropriate copyright owner for the reproduction of any text, illustration, or other material in your article. For further guidance on this topic please see: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/copyright/usingThirdPartyMaterial.asp>
2. **Third-party material:** If there is material in your article that is owned by a third party, please check that the necessary details of the copyright/rights owner are shown correctly.
3. **Affiliation:** The corresponding author is responsible for ensuring that address and email details are correct for all the co-authors. Affiliations given in the article should be the affiliation at the time the research was conducted. For further guidance on this topic please see: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/writing.asp>.
4. **Funding:** Was your research for this article funded by a funding agency? If so, please insert ‘This work was supported by <insert the name of the funding agency in full>’, followed by the grant number in square brackets ‘[grant number xxxx]’.
5. **Supplemental data and underlying research materials:** Do you wish to include the location of the underlying research materials (e.g. data, samples or models) for your article? If so, please insert this sentence before the reference section: ‘The underlying research materials for this article can be accessed at <full link>/ description of location [author to complete]’. If your article includes supplemental data, the link will also be provided in this paragraph. See <<http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/multimedia.asp>> for further explanation of supplemental data and underlying research materials.
6. The **CrossRef database** ([www.crossref.org/](http://www.crossref.org/)) has been used to validate the references. Changes resulting from mismatches are tracked in **red font**.

AQ1	Please check and confirm whether the country has been set correctly.
AQ2	Please provide missing keywords.
AQ3	Please check whether the inserted closing quotation mark following “socially situated” has been placed correctly. If not, please indicate where this should appear.
AQ4	Please check whether the inserted closing quotation mark following “voiceless creatures” has been placed correctly. If not, please indicate where this should appear.
AQ5	Please provide the Notes on contributors (regarding current academic position, research interests, books/articles published).
AQ6	The disclosure statement has been inserted. Please correct if this is inaccurate.

AQ7	The CrossRef database ( <a href="http://www.crossref.org/">www.crossref.org/</a> ) has been used to validate the references. Mismatches between the original manuscript and CrossRef are tracked in red font. Please provide a revision if the change is incorrect. Do not comment on correct changes.
AQ8	The reference “Animals Australia (2012)” is listed in the references list but is not cited in the text. Please either cite the reference or remove it from the references list.
AQ9	Please provide missing volume number and page numbers for the “Anomaly (2014)” references list entry.

## How to make corrections to your proofs using Adobe Acrobat/Reader

Taylor & Francis offers you a choice of options to help you make corrections to your proofs. Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can mark up the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat/Reader. This is the simplest and best way for you to ensure that your corrections will be incorporated. If you wish to do this, please follow these instructions:

1. Save the file to your hard disk.
2. Check which version of Adobe Acrobat/Reader you have on your computer. You can do this by clicking on the “Help” tab, and then “About”.

If Adobe Reader is not installed, you can get the latest version free from <http://get.adobe.com/reader/>.

3. If you have Adobe Acrobat/Reader 10 or a later version, click on the “Comment” link at the right-hand side to view the Comments pane.
4. You can then select any text and mark it up for deletion or replacement, or insert new text as needed. Please note that these will clearly be displayed in the Comments pane and secondary annotation is not needed to draw attention to your corrections. If you need to include new sections of text, it is also possible to add a comment to the proofs. To do this, use the Sticky Note tool in the task bar. Please also see our FAQs here: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/index.asp>.
5. Make sure that you save the file when you close the document before uploading it to CATS using the “Upload File” button on the online correction form. If you have more than one file, please zip them together and then upload the zip file.

If you prefer, you can make your corrections using the CATS online correction form.

## Troubleshooting

**Acrobat help:**<http://helpx.adobe.com/acrobat.html>

**Reader help:**<http://helpx.adobe.com/reader.html>

Please note that full user guides for earlier versions of these programs are available from the Adobe Help pages by clicking on the link “Previous versions” under the “Help and tutorials” heading from the relevant link above. Commenting functionality is available from Adobe Reader 8.0 onwards and from Adobe Acrobat 7.0 onwards.

**Firefox users:** Firefox’s inbuilt PDF Viewer is set to the default; please see the following for instructions on how to use this and download the PDF to your hard drive:  
[http://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/view-pdf-files-firefox-without-downloading-them#w\\_using-a-pdf-reader-plugin](http://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/view-pdf-files-firefox-without-downloading-them#w_using-a-pdf-reader-plugin)

## Doing animal welfare activism everyday: questions of identity

Debbie Rodan<sup>a</sup> and Jane Mummery<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Media & Cultural Studies, School of Communications and Arts, Edith Cowan University, Mount Lawley, Australia;

<sup>b</sup>Philosophy, Federation University Australia, Mount Helen Campus, Ballarat, Australia

AQ1  
5

### ABSTRACT

Animals Australia focuses on making animal welfare issues visible to consumers so as to direct consumer behaviour and invoke everyday activism, an objective integral to their 'Make it Possible' campaign. In this paper, we primarily explore the claimed and practised identity of everyday or mainstream animal activists. This is an identity that, whilst partially and communally elaborated and affirmed online (in the online Animals Australia community), is enacted more commonly through personal and familial everyday actions such as shopping, cooking and eating than it is through such public actions as explicitly advocating or demonstrating for better welfare standards for animals involved in factory farming. A discourse analysis was conducted of 2198 posts from October 2013 to January 2014 to analyse contributors' accounts of their feelings (notably their gut reactions) and reasons for pledging, as well as to examine how contributors' accounts of their everyday practices might be understood as the development of 'a voice for these "voiceless" animals'. Overall, then, our analysis has shown supporters, participants and/or consumers who support the 'Make it Possible' campaign self-select into and identify themselves in terms of four overlapping frames: being vegan or vegetarian, shopping for change, personal activism and public activism and advocacy. This paper contributes to the debate concerning intersectional activism within the food activism movement.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 5 May 2015

Accepted 15 October 2015

AQ2

### Introduction

Delivered across a diversity of platforms to the Australian public, the Animals Australia 'Make it Possible' campaign message has remained simple: factory farming is a major cause of animal cruelty; all factory-farmed animals experience a life of intolerable and unnecessary suffering; each of us can and should work to end the factory farming of animals (see Lyn White cited in Clark 2013). In direct response to this message (as of the end of February 2015), nearly 300,000 Australians have publicly pledged to boycott factory-farmed animal produce, reduce consumption of animal products and, in some cases, to become meat-free.<sup>1</sup> They have arguably become – typically without proclaiming it explicitly or directly nominating themselves as such – advocates or even activists calling for better animal welfare. Our primary focus in this paper is thus to explore the claimed and practised identity of these everyday or mainstream animal activists. This is an identity that, whilst partially and communally elaborated and affirmed online (in the online community formed under the aegis of Animals Australia), is enacted more commonly through personal and familial everyday actions such as shopping, cooking and eating than

10

15

it is through such public actions as explicitly advocating or demonstrating for better welfare standards for animals involved in factory farming. To examine this shared identity, we will examine what members of the public have written in their postings on the 'My Make it Possible Story' option in the Animals Australia website (October 2013–January 2014, the period containing the bulk of totally received posts), paying specific attention to the attitudes expressed by members of the public towards animal welfare and factory farming as well as their own practices. We contend that these practices are themselves a doing of animal welfare activism in the everyday.

## Contexts and methods

### *The 'Make it Possible' campaign and 'My Make it Possible Story' website*

Animals Australia focuses on making animal welfare issues visible to consumers so as to direct consumer behaviour, an objective integral to their 'Make it Possible' campaign. To achieve this, the 'Make it Possible' campaigners first produced a video, which was screened both on public television and uploaded into YouTube (launched October 2012). Combining *Babe* (1995) style animation effects with real footage from Australian factory farms, the 'Make it Possible' YouTube video presents animals as having human behaviours (being 'like' the viewers), possessing a similar interest in living a life of well-being. Engaging viewers' tacit knowledge of how it *feels* to be restricted, the animals in factory farms are presented (see the transcript in the Animals Australia website) as yearning for a better life, for 'a new way of living'. The animals are described as 'living lives of abject misery', denied 'the simple joys in life that we take for granted, freedom, sunshine, fresh air and exercise'; as 'waking up each day, just to suffer'; these descriptions are reinforced with images of overcrowding, confinement, lightlessness and industrial sterility. The campaign video reminds viewers that the animals kept in these barren and constrictive conditions are 'no different to our pets at home'; that they are 'highly intelligent creatures who feel pain, and who will respond to kindness and affection – if given the chance'; that they are 'someone, not something'. To further drive this message home, the producer anthropomorphizes the animals, giving them human voice, expression and desires. The animals are also individuated, with recurring close-ups of *real* animal faces and eyes, directly challenging any tendency for the viewers to see these animals as nothing more than a resource to be used, as livestock (or as computer generated and 'not real'). With its final scene of a winged pig escaping confinement, the video draws on a powerful social trope of exile, alienation and hope; it also stresses that social and political change requires consumers to seriously invest in bringing it about.

In October 2013, Animals Australia added an option into their website for people to share their 'My Make it Possible Story'. Here, viewers were asked two questions, both targeting affective responses:

- (1) 'How did you feel when you discovered that most eggs, poultry and pork products come from animals in factory farms?'
- (2) 'How has becoming informed changed your life?'

In responding, viewers could choose whether to make their responses public (public responses were subsequently used by Animals Australia to make radio advertisements for national broadcast). Importantly, responses exemplify testimonials of personal feelings and action as well as facilitating the formation of a shared activist identity among contributors.

## Methods

Launched on 21 October 2013, the 'My Make it Possible Story' website received, within a four-month period, over 2200 responses. Of these, nearly half – 1065 – were posted on the day the site opened. To capture this initial surge, the stories selected for analysis were posted between 21 October 2013 and 19 January 2014. These totalled 2198 and each was visited for further data collection and content analysis. The date and stated author of all collected stories were recorded, and key words and phrases

were highlighted and colour coded as categories and patterns began to emerge. Importantly, because qualitative research 'examines people's words and actions in narrative or descriptive ways [so as to] more closely represent ... the situation as experienced by the participants' (Maykut and Morehouse 1994, 2), and because what is relevant for this paper is to come to an understanding of contributors' assumed and practised collective identity, this paper engaged qualitative methods of data analysis, specifically discourse analysis.

A method for analysing context-specific forms of discourse in multiple modes and relations, discourse analysis facilitates the 'reading' of texts, conversations and documents so as to explore the connections between language, communication, knowledge, power and social practices. Designed to reveal how knowledge, practices and identities are organized, carried and reproduced in particular ways and through particular institutional practices, discourse analysis examines 'language-in-use' – as well as other elements such as values, symbols, tools and thinking styles – so as to identify and track 'socially situated identit[ies]' and 'taken-for-granted stories', i.e. 'situated meanings' (Gee 2010, 34, 40–41). Such a method is particularly productive, given its capacity to analyse contributors' accounts of their feelings (in particular their gut reactions) and reasons for pledging, as well as to examine how contributors' accounts of their everyday practices might be understood as the development of a voice for these "voiceless" animals' – a campaign phrase adopted by activist organizations and these everyday activists alike.

Each collected post was thus examined with regard to its formation and affirmation of particular activist meanings and identities. This meant the detailed examination of contributors' interpretations of animal industry farming practices, supermarket practices and their own everyday practices around shopping, food and eating; their affective responses to these various practices; and their framing of themselves – to various degrees – as everyday activists. This detailed examination was then the basis for our identification of specific shared activist perspectives and identities amongst the contributors. These thematically organized interpretations – of both the contributors and the authors – are detailed below.

### 'My Make it Possible Story': analysing the stories

With initial analysis showing that every story examined was supportive of the campaign message that animals are sentient and deserving of a much better life than what is typically allotted them, content analysis unsurprisingly found the top seven feelings described by story contributors with regard to the content of the campaign to be: sickness, horror, disgust, anger, sadness, shock and being brought to tears.<sup>2</sup> Respondents also articulated their strong feelings of having been misled by politicians, the health sector, the farming industry and the government, as well as – for some, mostly underage, respondents – their parents:

Outraged and betrayed. I feel we've been misled by up-beat ads encouraging Australians to eat pork and lamb and chicken – rolling country hills on the packaging – the myth of the 'family farm'. If the packaging (of meat and animal products) showed an accurate depiction of the means of production, I would have been a vegan long before now. (Meg 19 January 2014)

I felt being lied to for so many years, being told that animal products are necessary for my health, by doctors, advertisements, television, books, even my parents and everyone I know. (Diana 12 December 2013)

I am appalled that supermarkets are allowed to lie about products by calling them 'Free Range' when they evidently are not. I am appalled that the government endorses cruelty and does not enforce regulations on Factory Farms. (Mandy 21 October 2013)

Many of the contributors who shared their story also made reference to how the feelings invoked by the 'Make it Possible' campaign fitted with their existing beliefs and feelings about animals and animal cruelty.<sup>3</sup> Our analysis, for instance, showed that many of the contributors' feelings about animal cruelty, whilst reinforced by the Animals Australia's campaign, had already been invoked through either/or: childhood revelations or experiences; adult experiences working in abattoirs or in factory farms; and their previous consumption of video and print materials.<sup>4</sup> Contributed stories thus made clear that, for many story contributors, the 'Make it Possible' campaign was just one of the many modes they were aware of that exposed and lambasted cruelty to animals:



After witnessing only seconds (was all I could bare to watch) of that horrific video it messed with me emotionally for months. But it also triggered a passion and determination in me to fight for the welfare of these animals. From that moment on rather than burying my head in the sand I chose to be informed and educate myself on the truth of this horrific industry and all the other cruel animal trades rampant throughout Australia and the world. And although my heart breaks just a little each time I witness the footage of factory farming and other acts of animal cruelty alike, all in the name of greed. My eyes are open, never to be shut again! (Rebecca 21 October 2013).<sup>5</sup>

I was watching the Peta videos at the time and I was thinking, to myself: if some evil man will take my one year old baby and violently harm her, she will behave exactly like the cows and pigs do. She will cry of pain, try to lick her wounds, and try to avoid the man who hurts her ... We are vegans now, at first it was hard but now we are healthier and lets not forget the animals have three less mouths to feed with their own body parts. (Rafael 21 October 2013)

These two sample stories also demonstrate elements of the four major overlapping categories that became visible from analysis regarding story content and stated focus for activist commitments (set out as responses to the question concerning how becoming informed has changed the contributor's life). These are contributors' stated commitments to: being vegan (24%), shopping for change (31.5%), personal activism (26.5%) and broader public animal advocacy (12%). A much smaller category (6%) did not detail any new specific actions undertaken in their response to the two questions, although members of this cohort still expressed a commitment to the improvement of animal welfare. Each of the four primary categories is elaborated below, but it is also important to stress that categories are not discreet. They overlap and have blurry boundaries. An identified commitment to veganism can also, for instance, encompass commitments to the other categories – although of course it is not necessarily the case that commitments to other categories also encompass a commitment to veganism – meaning that a single narrative may include commitments to more than one category.

### *Being vegan or vegetarian*

There are several characteristics pertaining to contributions collected under the 'Being Vegan or Vegetarian' category. First, although 24% of the stories declared an explicit commitment to veganism<sup>6</sup> (or, in some instances, vegetarianism), for most contributors, this was a pre-existing commitment. Most contributors to this category claimed to already be vegan due to undergoing an earlier 'epiphany' experience (cf. Cherry 2006) regarding the consumption of meat or other animal products. Such epiphanies were typically described as arising from contributors experiencing first-hand or seeing footage of animal cruelty or from being influenced by animal rights campaigns and/or activists. In this category, however, whilst contributors strongly promoted their diet and lifestyle as an effective means of minimizing cruelty to animals, most did not articulate further commitments to participate in broader public advocacy or activism.

A second main characteristic was that those who identified as vegan or vegetarian clearly articulated that it was morally wrong to eat 'sentient beings'. Members of this category thus often stressed that 'meat used to be a someone':

Myself and my husband took the pledge and became vegetarians at the beginning of this year.... I have a clear conscious now and know it was the right thing to do. I view all sentient life as equal, I can't love a dog and cat but eat a cow and pig. It took me til my forties to realise this. There is an abundance of amazing vege food to discover and it is the only viable reality if we are to sustain our population growth. (Rachel 21 October 2013)

I will never look at animals & animal products ever the same again. How can you look into the innocent eyes of an animal & then think 'hey, im hungry now so it's time to die!' Im now vegan, how else can i live now i know an animal has to suffer for me. (Dianne 21 October 2013)

As a result of more research & listening to inspiring animal rights activists I became vegan & a staunch advocate for our sentient four-legged friends! I have been operating a vegetarian café for the past 5 years, & in the last 2 years we have increased the number of vegan dishes available to about 80%. My goal is for our menu to be totally vegan in the next 2 years. I feel very proud to be able to be a voice for the 'voiceless creatures'. (Elke 21 October 2013)

I tried to imagine myself being locked in a cage and in pain all the time. I believe very strongly that animals can feel all the emotions that we feel. To me they are SOMEONE and not SOMETHING! I stopped eating meat for a long time and now I've cut all dairy and eggs from my diet. I feel much better knowing there is nothing on my plate that came from someone who had to suffer for it. (Kristyn 21 October 2013)

Whereas other categories consistently referred to animals sharing some human capacities, the being vegan/vegetarian contributors strongly identified animals as being *fully* feeling, sentient creatures, as being just like humans. Probably for this reason, many vegan and vegetarian contributors also expressed feelings of euphoria or cleansing because of their decision to not eat or use any animal products.<sup>7</sup>

Thirdly, many contributors to this category also commented on the added benefits of such a diet, expressing, for instance, that they: felt a 'general health and well-being'; that vegan food is 'yum', 'interesting and delicious'; and that a vegan or vegetarian diet had given them a 'new outlook on life'. Many contributors also commented that 'being vegan is the best thing that ever happened to me'. Such views are evident in the following posts:

I went vegan, lost about 20 lbs, and became healthier mentally and physically. I believe, because of my vegan diet, I have more energy, and took a part in soccer, jogging, and many other active hobbies. I do not have the guilt of supporting animal cruelty by eating animal products. (Eva 16 November 2013)

In every possible way. Becoming a full-time vegetarian has led me to healthier eating and well-being, a more active lifestyle, ease of losing unwanted weight, higher energy levels, and improved performance at both work and study. (Navil 6 November 2013)

I have been vegan for a decade now. I ride long distances and even pass strong men who I'm riding up steep mountains. Last Saturday I rode 180 km with 5000 verticals metres. I am fitter and stronger than ever before, and happy with my choices. I always try to wear my message on my cycling jerseys. I think I spread a positive message. (Leah 21 October 2013)

Completely! I feel like I'm creating positive change by cutting animal products from my diet and advocating for other's change through my blog The Power Plant. I share yummy recipes, restaurant reviews, animal friendly product reviews and tips for living a cruelty-free life. I've helped over 8 people make the decision to cut down on meat, go vegetarian and go vegan too! (Jenna 21 October 2013)

About a year ago I decided to go vegetarian. And about 5 months ago I decided that wasn't enough- so I embraced veganism. Haven't looked back since. The thought that I am doing my best to live compassionately is the driving force. The AMAZING health benefits are a bonus. People need not be scared by the change, but happy that they are making better, informed choices for the animals, and for their health!! (Rebecca 21 October 2013)

Finally, our analysis found that comparatively few of the contributors in articulating their commitment to veganism or vegetarianism also committed explicitly to negotiating 'new understandings' about factory farming with 'intimate circles of friends and family', for instance. Arguably, however, the very practice of a vegan diet means constant negotiations with family and friends about dietary and lifestyle choices, negotiations that cannot but raise broader issues about the status and use of animals for interlocutors. And indeed there is a sense in stories supporting this category that committed vegans, in particular, view themselves as spearheading and supporting a broader social change (cf. Cherry 2006): 'People need not be scared by the change', 'I share yummy recipes ... and tips for living a cruelty-free life', 'I think I spread a positive message'. In this sense, then, posting publicly about the benefits of a vegan or vegetarian diet – for both humans and livestock animals – can arguably be read as educative, as committed to showing other contributors and visitors to the site that a vegan lifestyle is not only possible but enjoyable.

### *Shopping for change*

As opposed to the above expressed commitments to veganism or vegetarianism, a broader albeit overlapping category is visible relating to contributors' choices to shop for change (31.5%). This category comprises contributors who explicitly pledge to change both their own shopping (and eating) habits and those of family and friends, with many declaring that although they still ate meat – unlike the self-identified cohort of vegans or vegetarians – their commitment was to a more ethical form of consumption (of meat and other animal products).<sup>8</sup> Stories included under the shopping for change category were thus selected on the basis of their explicit reference to shopping whilst giving weight to animal welfare. For instance, stories collected under this category typically talked of the importance of being 'selective' when 'buying animal products'. One contributor aptly captured this tendency when he said: 'I think before I buy and I think before I eat' (David 21 October 2013). Here are others in that category:

I only buy sow stall free pork, free range chicken and eggs, and organic mince. I try to teach my children the importance of respecting all life, even if it is bred to be food for us. I never knew the extent, and true horrors, of factory farming however, until this campaign brought it to my attention. Thank you. (Brooke 21 October 2013)

Now whenever I go to the supermarket with Mum I make sure that she always buys free range products. I also have had something inside me tell me that I have to help make a difference and spread the word. I have been and touched and inspired for life. (Millie 21 October 2013)

Free range and sow stall free is now how I shop. It's been amazing how many conversations have started at the egg section of the supermarket while selecting free range with other consumers commenting how it is the way to go – how can anything healthy come out of an unhealthy and unhappy chicken? (Melinda 21 October 2013)

I shop more carefully now. I only purchase free range eggs, and although I rarely eat meat, when I do buy it, I make sure it's not factory farmed. It can be difficult and the labelling on products needs to be clear but I only have to see these animals in my imagination to know its worth the extra effort to find it. (Suzanne 21 October 2013)

I naturally do [not] eat a lot of meat. I do eat a little, though, and I eat eggs and use milk and butter. When I purchase these products I do it consciously. I prefer to buy my meat from a pasture to plate butcher, I used to have a farmers market I went to weekly, though this is not available to me anymore. When shopping in the larger grocery stores I seek out the free range chicken products. Unfortunately it's really difficult when buying meat as there are minimal labels explaining where the meat came from. However I do look for these if I can't get to a butcher who I know supports healthy, conscious farming. (Christine 21 October 2013)

I now look for factory free labels on meat packaging, shop more frequently at butchers further away than the supermarket and eat less meat! (Jade 21 October 2013)

Many contributors talked explicitly about their attempts to be responsible and ethical consumers, taking action with their purchasing decisions, recognizing that 'buying power was in the hands of the masses'. Hence, stories consistently included such phrases as: 'as a consumer we have the power', 'avoid factory farmed goods', make an 'informed consumer choice' and 'pledge to consume less animal products', with such commitments in fact mirroring the first two pledges called for by the actual 'Make it Possible' campaign. This sense of an acceptance of forms of consumption considerate of animal welfare is expressed as follows:

I gave up eating meat, I have been a pescaterian for 12 months now and I am very selective about the fish I buy and only support animal friendly dairy farmers for milk and yogurt. I also sleep with my flying pig and lamb every night, I like that it reminds me each morning when I wake to be responsible in my buying choices and protect my animal family. (Kim 11 December 2013)

I won't eat anything unless I know it's made from free range eggs-which is a great way to lose a desire for the majority of cakes! I watch the major supermarkets very closely and chose products that I believe are ethically and responsibly produced. (Nicole 21 October 2013)

I only ever now buy free range eggs and chicken. Pork must be the pink pork and if the supermarket or Aussie Farmers don't stock it then I just don't buy it. We go without. Also I always look for the cruelty free logo on all product and I have found there are some great Aussie made products that tick all the boxes. Even small cosmetic companies like Adorn Miners! Cosmetics can do it then the big companies should be able to do it too. (Sonya 29 October 2013)

Now I really think before I buy. The plight of pigs has upset me more than anything. I only buy free range pork products now (including ham and bacon) and whilst I try to go 'meat free' at least 3–4 times a week, I am encouraging my family to do the same. I feel more empowered to make a difference to the lives of these animals and I am committed to do so with my buying power and by spreading the word. (Marian 23 October 2013)

These attitudes of course come out of the consumer action tradition which contends that consumers have 'power' to promote and enable change.<sup>9</sup> Such attitudes are clearly evidenced in the following comments:

I believe it's about choice. That's what is important. If the public is informed about factory farming then this allows us the consumer to flex our power in the way of choice and supermarkets will want to keep customers happy. The supermarkets are listening as consumers are becoming more informed and making factory farming free choices. (Belinda 21 October 2013)

This information made me become proactive in choosing my products from supermarkets. My daughter and I have found that our health has improved. We like to spread the word to friends and fellow shoppers, proudly carrying our Make it Possible shopping bag :D). (Billie-Jane 22 October 2013)

We as consumers have that power, we just need to be the voice for the voiceless and make a stand. I now see what we buy as more than just where we spend our money, we can either choose to contribute to the suffering of

thousands of animals each time we buy dinner, or we can make the compassionate decision to do the right thing. Information is power. (Cameron 22 October 2013)

In researching and sourcing cruelty-free products, these consumers are hence engaging identifiable micro-strategies of boycotting (positive buying)<sup>10</sup> and boycotting. Stories fitting this category talk about shopping more wisely and 'carefully' by reading 'the details on the packaging', by looking 'at product labels' and by looking 'for food labels'. Other participants said:

I feel more informed about my choices. I am contributing in a positive way to my society. When I read the email that Woolworths has decided to stop using caged eggs as their home brand eggs, I cried with joy! I felt a part of something dramatic and historic! I have since boycotted KFC (a seriously tough decision lol) until they stop using broilers and start using a more ethical process. People power! (Carla 10 December 2013)

I now shop for animal friendly products, e.g. free range, RSPCA approved, etc. and engage with my local supermarket to stock these items in greater abundance, while also increasing substantially our family vegetable intake to cut down the need to overly load our diet with meat. (Linda 21 October 2013)

... I needed to change my shopping habits – and even consider my diet. Now I study labels more carefully – and even then – I research as best I can to ensure the labels are not misleading, I look for other options – to see if my diet can be changed. (Irma 21 October 2013)

Less is more. If I am suspicious that the produce is not cruelty free I will go without. Factory farming is an abomination. Sourcing cruelty free produce is my husband's and my priority. I always find out where the produce originates whether it be in a restaurant, club, pub or butcher. (Veronica and Sidney 21 October 2013)

Being vegetarian was not enough, I needed to do my shopping wisely and let companies know their practices were not acceptable. (Michele 21 October 2013)

One participant even commented that her shopping list on the fridge was magnetized by Animals Australia stickers and magnets (Margo 21 October 2013); she intended giving these to her family and friends.

Arguably, these consumers can be identified as proponents of ethical consumerism (cf. Shaw, Newholm, and Dickinson 2006) who are campaigning – both through their everyday shopping and more explicitly – for supermarkets and corporations to provide goods sourced from ethical production practices.<sup>11</sup> Stories thus talk of shopping practices in a sense that is 'not just declarative' but 'performative' (in J. L. Austin's sense; see Glickman 2009, 6), a point we will explore further in the final section. Overall, then, from the perspective of shopping being *performative*, those contributors who are shopping for change clearly understand their everyday shopping practices as their participation in a struggle for societal change.

### Personal activism

The next two categories – 'Personal Activism' and 'Public Activism and Advocacy' – are closely related, both marking contributors' explicit commitments to broader forms of animal advocacy. The third category thus foregrounds contributors who have vowed not just to consume more ethically but to educate others (26.5%). These stories thus talk of contributors' commitments to not only consume more ethically by pledging to eat 'cruelty free' as well as to strive to not consume animal products, but also to make an effort to consciousness raise or educate others about their food choices. Certainly these commitments also fit into the previous category of shopping for change (and some into the first category of being vegan or vegetarian), but what is clear with regard to the stories collected here is that they tell of a personal advocacy for animals that goes beyond buying, choosing, shopping and purchasing. Stories here describe commitments to consciousness raising, education, giving public voice to the ways in which factory farming is a cruel practice.

As with many of the stories collected in the previous category of shopping for change, ethical consumption for many of those committed to this broader mission of personal activism does not necessarily mean not eating meat. Rather the focus – shared with the shopping for change contributors – is on the need for research so as to not eat meat and other products sourced from animals that were subjected to cruelty. Comments such as not eating animals that were 'caged or confined', sourcing meat only from

very 'trusted and respected' places, eating 'factory farm free' (either commercially or home produced, i.e. giving a home to 'ex battery hens') expressed this ethical commitment. Here are some samples:

I do not buy commercial meat. Any meat we consume comes from friends farms who have the same ethos as we do with regard to respecting the animals they grow for food. Some will say it's easier to do this in a little rural town, but people in suburban areas can do so the same thing by keeping a couple of hens, growing their own veggies and considering where their meat comes from before they buy it. They could even form a produce swap market in their community which, after all is just a condensed village. We can all make a difference, we just need to care enough to do so. (Jan 21 October 2013)

I tried reducing the amount of meat products but there was no way I could give it up completely, until I watched the Make It Possible ad. I jumped straight on to the website, and both my husband and I made a pledge to not eat meat products. 12 months later and we are still not eating any meat products to help give a voice to the animals. (Samoa 22 October 2013)

Changing my diet also made me to become more conscious about buying other products that might harm/abuse animals (cosmetics, natural leather, natural fur, etc.) I couldn't exclude the animal products from my food diet completely, I still eat organic eggs/milk/dairy and fish, and occasionally, organic chicken (although I think that even organic farms are not always can be much better, you still need to know well the farm and how they work). (Svetlana 22 October 2013)

Contributors also wrote they felt a responsibility to influence family and friends 'whenever possible'. Often, participants said they wanted or desired to educate others, deliver information and inform people:

I have always bought free range eggs and have finally found a free range butcher locally. I'm not telling my friends to become vegetarians but just to think that every animals deserves to live a decent, humane life whilst they're here on this planet. (Anne 21 October 2013)

I always eat vegetarian when I am unsure of how the animal products on the menu were produced and try to patronise restaurants where care is taken in serving only ethically produced products. I encourage others to do the same and to cut back on their meat and animal product consumption. I only support producers who have ethical practices and keep up to date on who they are. I try to educate others as many people are still very ignorant when it comes to how we treat our animals. I talk to producers about how they run their farms. Many small producers are passionate about what they do and they should be recognised for it. (Kay 21 October 2013)

A corollary of this commitment is that contributors also often expressed feelings of guilt for their past actions and choices, some feeling compelled to make up for unethical choices made before they became aware of the plight of factory-farmed animals.

Once you know something, you cannot 'un-know' it. Everyone has their own moral compass and I want to be part of the solution, not part of the problem. (Sharon 21 October 2013)

I now view meat as 'flesh'. I have become so much more aware of my food choices wanting to know where the food comes from. If it is GMO cruelty free, and preferably only organic. I am striving to be completely meat and dairy free. I believe future generations will look back in angst at the barbaric behavior we display as meat eating humans. (Angela 21 October 2013)

Despite these and previous contributors' very clear commitments to both individual and societal change, however, the stories categorized so far into the three overlapping categories already discussed – being vegan or vegetarian, shopping for change and personal activism – demonstrate what Bobel (2007) has called a 'doing activism' rather than a 'being activist'. As Chatterton and Pickerill (2010, 487) similarly note, this works as a description of those who may willingly participate in activism whilst not necessarily self-identifying as *being* an activist. This is not to diminish the value of the actions already described; after all, all such actions work for change, increasing the animal welfare movement's opportunity to engage 'a broader range of participants' beyond its already existing members (487). It is this point, however, of *being* an activist as well as *doing* activism that separates stories collected in the fourth category from the others. This last grouping sees contributors explicitly identifying themselves as activists.

### Public activism and advocacy

Stories in this fourth and final category thus saw contributors stating that their increased awareness of the plight of factory-farmed animals meant that they felt morally or duty bound to take public action.



Such public action included committing to broader political actions, such as publically educating others, donating and petitioning, etc.

I donate to groups who try to end animal suffering and I try to inform others. I have read and researched broadly on animal rights and have actively assisted in animal rescue. I don't believe you can be exposed to the truth of these issues and not be changed forever. (Kim 21 October 2013)

I am now a vegetarian and do everything in my power to share the knowledge that I have, through facebook and signing petitions etc. (Saria 21 October 2013)

I cried myself to sleep for many days. Then I started to collect signatures, donate money and make better choices. I also try to create awareness to those who still do not know what is happening. (Noelia 21 October 2013)

I sign online petitions daily, and share about their fate to those that will listen and on my FB. I give donations when I can and pray that in time I will be able to do them more often with higher amounts! I'm very conscientiousness to make sure my money is supporting what I believe in. I will be a voice for the animals for the rest of my life! God Bless them all! (RaKelle 29 October 2013)

I became a vegetarian 3 years ago. This has changed by life, I feel so good because of my decision. I try to select products that are cruelty free, and I try to educate friends and family to choose their products more carefully. I donate to RSPCA, WSPA, AWL, Orang-utan project and more when I can. We fund raise for animal charities. I even have a facebook page called 'I love all creatures great and small' I LOVE ALL ANIMALS. (Lurelle 21 October 2013)

Many stories thus consistently used words and phrases about taking public action, such as posting, and spreading the word. For instance, contributors said they 'sent protest letters to the government', 'spread the word via social media', in particular sharing Animals Australia's posts. Others described asking farmers questions (about their animal practices), and talking about having attended rallies.

I work in Coles & I am constantly congratulating customers if they choose 'Free Range' Eggs or Meat. I also berate those that do not make an Animal Friendly choice. I write letters to papers, Politicians and anyone else who can help to make this a Kinder World for Animals xxx. (Julia 11 December 2013)

2013, I made a pledge to adopt a Cruelty Free Lifestyle. I created a dedicated Cruelty Free YouTube channel 'Lotions Potions Diva' and I created my website, a place of support and inspiration for those seeking a Cruelty Free Lifestyle. My aim is to inspire people to adopt a cruelty free philosophy. My focus is to shift market demand and change consumer buying behaviour, focusing on protecting our natural environment and the animal kingdom. Corporate transparency and company responsibility are key factors that influence my buying choices and I share that information with my global community. (Veleacha 21 October 2013)

I have an animal cruelty page of my own, on facebook and I try very hard to make others see the true realities, behind what really goes on with our beloved animals..... becoming informed is mortifying, if you have a heart..... if banded hearts stick together, there will be a change for the animals and this is what needs to be done!!!! (Natalie 21 October 2013)

Once I learned of this atrocity, I was eager to spread awareness. As the school's environment representative, I and my partner addressed the school assembly with a presentation for all to hear. We talked about the truth as to how their food reached them, as well as the kinder options and multiple issues surrounding factory farming. We also played a video which we'd found on the animalsaustralia' website. I also ordered flyers and posters which were then placed around the entire school. (Lydia 29 October 2013)

Others said they were 'lobbying wherever and whenever' (including the 'purveyors of those products'), and actively assisting in animal rescue, such as:

I have gone vegetarian and I adopted 5 rescue chickens from Edgar's Mission in May this year. These 5 beautiful souls have made me even more determined to do what I can to help the animals. I go to most of the protests and let my friends know through Facebook that factory farming and live export is NOT acceptable. I shop that way too and have noticed that the supermarkets are starting to take notice. People power!! (Katrina 1 November 2013)

Not at all happy. I changed to free range eggs, and wrote a letter of disapproval to Pace poultry farms, re. cage eggs Stopped buying pork products. Haven't bought pork for years. Wrote letters to the formers labour govt Minister for agriculture (Ian Macfarlane ?). (Janice 21 October 2013)

I use my Animals Australia shopping bags always, in the hope of raising the awareness of others. I've petitioned members of parliament etc. when requested, and I've found some very moving quotes ... both by Mahatma Ghandi. (Annie 21 October 2013)

I continued to learn all i could about the horrors of factory farming as well as vivisection, fur farming and all the ways that humans inflict violence on animals. I attend legislative sessions to voice my concerns, hand out leaflets

at the university and talk to anyone who will listen and hope they will open their hearts to these animals. (Carol 21 October 2013)

#### Others explicitly named themselves activists:

I became an activist. Today, I speak out regarding animal rights/welfare issues and try to educate and inform others. Awareness is crucial for this. (Anna 21 October 2013)

I became an activist for animal rights. And vegetarian. I'm a singer, songwriter, and just write a song 'Animal' that I posted on myspace ... I'm going to put a video on youtube with pictures of animals and my songs for animals and raise awareness. (Degrotte 21 October 2013)

I am now 28 and an animal rights activist. I attended many rallies for Animals Australia and donated countless times. By being informed it has helped me share my views with friends and family; share all posts from Animals Australia on my social media to spread the word, even take random company along to rally with me, urge others to look out for certain labels on meat and dairy products and helped to donate all the proceeds from my late fathers funeral to Animals Australia. (Christina 21 October 2013)

It has turned me from a vegetarian who mostly kept her opinions to herself to an animal rights activist who attends rallies, share my knowledge and information with everyone I can. I read books, join discussions, animal rights events and volunteer for worthy causes. Myself and my family have changed in many ways. Make it Possible was just the start! (Laura 11 December 2013)

In these instances, then, for these contributors, activism has clearly become not just 'a way of life', but an integral identity (see Horton 2003, 66).

#### Animals Australia: identity and everyday activism

I am a vegetarian trying to become a vegan. I cook vegetarian food for my friends to show them meat isn't necessary for food to be delicious. I am grateful to Animals Australia for running this campaign because now I am connected to the thousands of other Australians who feel the same as I do about factory farming and I know that together we will win. ... (Wendy 24 October 2013)

What is clear from this analysis is that respondents to the campaign are self-selecting into particular frameworks for identity and action, processes of identification and for correlative activism represented by both the feelings and actions in their stated commitments. It is also generally evident that all contributors to the Animals Australia 'My Make it Possible Story' website in this period desire to become more ethical in their consumption practices and to raise people's consciousness about the need for action and change.<sup>12</sup> They clearly come to identify with the animal welfare movement described through the campaign, an identification demonstrated through their accepting and sharing of the stated actions/objectives of the campaign: consuming ethically (whether this means committing to veganism or vegetarianism or choosing cruelty-free produce), and spreading the word about factory farming. They all individually normalize practices of what is arguably an everyday activism, seeing them as integral components of their everyday identities and lives.

Such individual commitments and practices can be understood as contributors accepting and adhering to specific collective identities. Such would include, firstly, that of an animal advocate/activist insofar as they function as a member of (at the very least) the animal advocacy/activist community that is supported by Animals Australia through their online and offline campaigning. Also included would be their performance of the more specific forms of identity examined earlier. Regarding these ideas, Melucci describes the development of a collective identity as a three-pronged process, involving: (1) a sharing of cognitive definitions concerning the ends, means and field of action; (2) 'a network of active relationships between actors, who interact, communicate, influence each other, negotiate, and make decisions'; and (3) 'a certain degree of emotional investment, which enables individuals to feel like part of a common unity' (2013, 79). Importantly, as Melucci (2013, 80) stresses, cognition comes with feeling and meaning comes with emotion.

Along similar lines, Poletta and Jasper define collective identity 'as an individual's cognitive, moral, and emotional connection with a broader community, category, practice, or institution'. The individual, in other words, perceives a 'shared status or relation, which may be imagined rather than experienced

directly, and [which] is distinct from personal identities, although it may form part of a personal identity' (2001, 285). All of these aspects of collective identity are clearly identifiable with respect to the 'Make it Possible' campaign. Not only does the campaign itself, along with its links into the broader Animals Australia website and its plethora of additional information and campaigns, clearly set out the ends, means and field of action, it provides the mechanisms that interrelate participants. Further, it is a feature of this campaign that respondents are brought to affectively invest in it, as well as to articulate and share their affective discharge along with their mobilization (see Mummery et al. 2014; Rodan and Mummery 2014a, 2014b). These processes work in turn to strengthen their identification and recognition of themselves as animal advocates.

These are important points because while several researchers have found that 'identity issues' in new social movements, such as animal welfare, can become mobilizing factors (see Jasper and Poulsen 1995; McAdam 1994; Melucci 1994), others (Johnston, Laraña, and Gusfield 1994, 23) have also commented that this is dependent on how well the activists' 'grievance' is linked into 'the everyday lives of the participants'. For participants taking part in the animal welfare movement, then, what is thus arguably integral is that their respective individual, collective and public identities<sup>13</sup> merge as they make meaningful (to them) everyday life choices to take action: to choose cruelty-free products, commit to changing eating and living habits, inform others, raise awareness and spread the word. To put this another way, drawing here also on Horton's examination as to how common sense for a particular cultural group can be acquired and sustained, what matters is 'reiterative performance' (Horton 2003, 69) through which the *doing* of activism – as detailed in the above sections – comes to coalesce with identification with the animal welfare movement as activists/advocates. We propose that it is by embedding animal welfare friendly everyday actions into everyday life, all of these participants from all of the four categories of practice can arguably be identified as activists.<sup>14</sup>

This, we would argue, is also significant in that it does not fully fit with the typical understanding of activist identity construction, outlined above, which emphasizes the purposive alignment of personal identity ('I care about animal welfare', 'I am compassionate') with the group's collective identity as the basis for self-conception as an activist. Such alignment can be exemplified in what is termed identity politics, where the expression and promotion of a particular identity itself function as a political act (e.g. as in the case of gay and lesbian activism). For at least some of the 'Make it Possible' participants examined above, however, their actions rather seem to precede and construct their activist identity (exceptions would be, for example, the self-identified vegans and vegetarians). Also significant for the 'Make it Possible' participants' development of an activist identity is the role of storytelling and sharing. Examined by Ruiz-Junco (2011) as 'biographical identity integration', this is the use of personal storytelling to integrate personal experience and everyday actions into a meaningful biography that fits the acquired activist identity. Such work is clearly important for these participants.

It is finally of interest with regard to these practices of identity acceptance and affirmation that of the participants who posted on the Animal's Australia 'My Make it Possible Story' website, 80% appear to be female, their sex determined by their photograph and/or first name. This raises several issues. First is that the animals movements, whether oriented towards rights or welfare, have been typically shown to have a predominance of female members, with current studies showing that women constitute 68–80% of the animal rights movement (Gaarder 2011; Jasper and Poulsen 1995; Lowe and Ginsberg 2002).<sup>15</sup> Studies have thus shown that regardless of age, educational level or political views, women are more likely than men to (1) be animal advocates (Kruse 1999); (2) support animal rights (Peek, Bell, and Dunham 1996) and; (3) express concern about the treatment of animals (Driscoll 1992). There have been several attempts to explain this phenomenon. Pertinent factors have been proposed as including: prevailing and/or continuing gendered economic structures [as Jasper and Nelkin (1992) put it, women may possess more time and flexibility for activism]; women still being more likely the primary caretakers of animals within households and therefore more likely to bond and empathize with animals (Kruse 1999); women being more likely to identify with the oppressed status of animals because of their own experiences of oppression<sup>16</sup> (Gaarder 2011); and women still being socialized towards an acceptance of relationality and of the display of compassion to others.



Whilst these are of course contentious issues, this last does raise particularly interesting points regarding the 'Make it Possible' campaign. First, it is non-contentious to claim that everyday practices of care are themselves still gendered in their exercise, with women still carrying out the majority of household work and childcare, and arguably also the majority of shopping and food preparation. If this is so, and given that the clear majority of participants in the 'Make it Possible' campaign are women, it is no surprise that everyday practices of providing food become key points at which activism for these participants is expressed and supported on a daily basis. It is also worth noting the recognition of many participants that their everyday embodied practices of activism are also informed by concerns for food safety and their own health. Expressed most strongly in the being vegan or vegetarian category, but still a clear thread in the other categories, this commitment is informed, according to participants, by both their personal experiences of improvements in health and their growing knowledge backed by their preparedness to research for their food selection. This is of course a significant point across much food activism, with human health concerns becoming a growing basis for calls to reform factory-farming practices (Akhtar 2012).<sup>17</sup>

As has previously been analysed (Mummery et al. 2014; Rodan and Mummery 2014a, 2014b), this campaign explicitly targets both the affective domain and, as examined above, people's everyday practices. What is also clear is that these practices – shopping, cooking, eating and engaging with family and friends – are themselves arguably constitutively relational and framed around an ethic of care: of family, friends, society and of course animals. Caring is after all the point for this campaign and, more generally, a driver for any social change and arguably, then, this is the core identity construction being called for and promoted by the campaign insofar as it then supposedly informs both everyday activities and modes of living.

Finally, it is of note that there have been uneasy relations between animal welfare (and rights) activists and food activism campaigns such as 'Make it Possible' insofar as the former may see such campaigns as continuing to support unethical practices. The 'Make it Possible' campaign, for example, does not argue against animal-based agriculture as such or against the development and consumption of animal products per se, practices that some food activists would consider unethical. Such unease manifests, for example, in the campaign in the strong educative push clear in the posts of many of the self-identified vegans who argue – in many cases against other contributors – that the best and/or only moral position with regard to food production is that of veganism:

How can you look into the innocent eyes of an animal & then think 'hey, im hungry now so it's time to die!' Im now vegan, how else can i live now i know an animal has to suffer for me. (Dianne 21 October 2013)

Such unease is also evident in broader examinations of food activism, where unity or even solidarity between differently oriented campaigns can be difficult to achieve. As Sebo (2015) notes, not only are campaigns oriented to different causes – for instance, improving animal welfare, protecting labour rights, eradicating synthetic chemical use or minimizing one's carbon footprint as a consumer – but different food activism approaches 'such as abolition and regulation and revolution and reform, are diametrically opposed to each other'. Such a situation, Sebo argues, is profoundly problematic insofar as it divides and factionalizes not only shared aims but possible campaign members.

What the stories published in response to the 'Make it Possible' campaign make clear, however, is that cause commitments – such as committing to veganism or vegetarianism, or to not eat factory-farmed animal products or to act as an advocate for improvements in animal welfare and with regard to raising mainstream awareness of animal welfare – might be distinct with regard to their underpinning ethical principles but can substantially overlap in everyday practice. As such, although we have identified multiple frames for identity construction being utilized within campaign stories, we would argue that the forms of everyday activism taken and talked about by participants signal their effective convergence much more than their differences. Such a finding is particularly significant, we would suggest, for the development of food activism campaigns – such as 'Make it Possible' – which explicitly work towards seeing diversely positioned mainstream consumers practice the broad identity and commitments of activists. We would suggest, in other words, that the 'Make it Possible' stories clearly demonstrate the

possibility and effectiveness within the broader contested movement of food activism of what Sebo (2015) calls an intersectional unity, the engagement and interaction of multiple positions with regard to specific social change. Broad intersectional unity, after all, is arguably fundamental for any achievement of change in people's everyday behaviour.

Overall, then, this analysis has shown supporters, participants and/or consumers who support the 'Make it Possible' campaign self-select into and identify themselves in terms of four overlapping frames: being vegan or vegetarian, shopping for change, personal activism and public activism and advocacy. Framing not just constitutive actions, but possible identity constructions, these four categories all affirm participants as everyday activists for the animal welfare movement, as constituting them in terms of a collective identity as both caring about animal lives and as – thereby – animal activists or advocates. This caring in turn explicitly informs their identity and their actions. Finally, despite the commonplace view of many animal rights activists who have argued that veganism is the only possible ground and identity for animal activism,<sup>18</sup> this campaign and our analysis make quite clear that mainstream consumers can also be brought to identify themselves and to function productively as animal activists. Indeed, we would contend that it is only with the involvement of mainstream consumers, with their identification and everyday practices of themselves as being animal advocates and activists, that social and political change will develop with regard to the status of animals. On this issue, then, of connecting mainstream consumers with the issues of animal welfare, of facilitating their identification and everyday practice as animal advocates and activists, the 'Make it Possible' campaign has been, we argue, highly successful. [AQ5](#)

## Notes

1. Also within this period, the extended YouTube video was viewed over 297,000 times, shared more than 3000 times, liked over 3000 times and received 877 comments, 88% supportive. Public response also extended to enough donations for television and print advertising, grass-roots outreach initiatives and to generally increase Animals Australia's lobbying power towards ending legal exemptions that permit cruelty to animals in factory farms (also see Rodan and Mummery 2014a).
2. Studies of animal rights movement activists have found activists expressing similar feelings when viewing images of animal cruelty such as felt 'like crying', 'felt sick', etc. (see Einwohner 2002, 261).
3. As Jasper and Poulsen (1995, 494) found in their research on animal rights, individuals not affiliated with the movement can be 'recruited because of the beliefs and feelings they already have'.
4. Such materials included – as specified by contributors – (a) documentaries, such as *Four Corners* (2011) 'A Bloody Business', Jamie Oliver's *Fowl Dinners* (2008) on caged chickens, *Earthlings* (2005), *The End of the Line* (2009) about tuna over fishing, Paul McCartney's narration of PETA's video *Glass Walls* (2009) on slaughter houses, *A Kiss Before Dying* (2009) and *The Cove* (2009) about dolphin hunting practices; (b) campaigns found on the Internet and/or YouTube including Animals Australia's 'Make it Possible' campaign and video on baby calves, PETA's videos and the website Voices for Change (<http://www.peopleforglobaljustice.com/>); (c) print materials such as Animals Australia's report *Live Animal Export*, Peter Singer's book *Animal Liberation* (1975), Jeffrey Mason's *The Pig who Sang to the Moon: The Emotional World of Farm Animals* (2003), Robin Cook's novel *Toxin* (1998) and John Robbins *Diet for New America: How Your Food Choices Affect Your Health, Happiness and the Future of Life on Earth* (1987); and (d) social media such as Facebook.
5. We have chosen not to edit posts. Any spelling, punctuation and grammatical anomalies are as quoted. Typographical errors may arguably indicate high levels of synchronous engagement on the part of posters.
6. As of 16 March 2015, the Vegan Society defines a vegan in their website as someone who eats 'a plant-based diet avoiding all animal foods such as meat, dairy, eggs and honey – as well as products like leather and any tested on animals'.
7. Some participants in this category can be understood as being on a kind of 'quest for purity', a quest played out through everyday activists carefully controlling their purchase of consumables – such as clothing, make-up, types of soap as well as food products – as part of their ethical journey (Jacobsson and Lindblom 2012, 51).
8. One respondent declared: I am 'not a vegetarian, but rarely eat meat'. Others commented that while they still eat meat, they took time to select only free range or non-factory-farmed meat.
9. Consumer activism has a long history, emerging in the eighteenth century as more commodities such as sugar and spices became available in the market. An early form of ethical shopping movement emerged when consumer activists boycotted goods produced through slavery (see Hawkins 2010, 125). Although this boycott was a tactic emerging out of the Anti-slavery movement, it was a precursor to the Fair Trade movement and the recent Ethical shopping movement (Glickman 2009; Hilton 2009).




10. When consumers 'deliberately' purchase particular products or 'a company's or country's products' to support particular 'policies', this is termed a 'boycott' (Hawkins 2010, 124). In the case of eggs, for instance, within Australia, currently there are Internet websites and individual consumers advocating boycotts within major supermarkets by promoting the purchase of free-range eggs [see also the opposition to GMO foods in European supermarkets (Kurzer and Cooper 2007)].
11. Such a view assumes, as Shaw, Newholm and Dickinson (2006, 1051) outline, that 'Consumers can be seen as creating the societies of which they are a part by their purchases just as they may influence their environments by their votes in political elections'. Such a view is not new, with Anwar Fazaz, President of the International Organisation of Consumer Unions, noting back in 1986 that: 'The act of buying is a vote for an economic and social model, for a particular way of producing goods. We are concerned with the quality of goods and the satisfactions we derive from them. But we cannot ignore the conditions under which products are made – the environmental impact and working conditions. We are linked to them and therefore have a responsibility for them' (cited in Dickinson and Carsky 2005, 25).
12. For animal rights activists and the animal welfare movement, animals are seen as the 'ultimate victim' because they are 'innocent, voiceless, and defenceless' (Pallotta 2005, 91).
13. Johnston, Laraña and Gusfield (1994, 12) claim there are three distinct dimensions of identity that stand out as central participation in social movements: (1) individual identity; (2) collective identity; and (3) public identity.
14. Within the public domain, the animal welfare movement and academe, there have been expressions of scepticism as to whether ethical consumerism has the capacity to bring about long-lasting change. Levinson (2001) has questioned whether animal activists/consumers will drop their ethical concerns about the politics behind products when the private economy slumps, and when other preferences entice everyday activists in a different direction. Littler (2011, 27) has wondered whether ethical consumption is ultimately ineffective because it is 'used by a minority as a panacea for middle-class guilt' or because it stresses individualistic action over collective solidarity; and whether ethical consumerism is simply too entangled in consumer capitalism to achieve any radical purchase. And Heath and Potter (2004) have asked whether ethical consumption will merely be subsumed into the further creation of a problematic consumer society. Our proposal is that the identification and embedding of everyday actions into everyday life are itself productive of the merging of individual, collective and public identities.
15. Surveys conducted by *The Animals' Agenda* (March/April 1985, 10) – described as the animal movements' 'most prominent periodical' – found: 'In organization after organization polled, [women] rarely dipped below 70 percent of the total membership, and several outfits showed a female participatory rate nearing 100 percent' (cited in Jasper and Poulsen 1995, 502).
16. Gaarder (2011, 58) has named this explanation for women's higher levels of animal advocacy "empathy based on shared inequities": The idea that women identify with the oppression of animals based on similar experiences of objectification, subordination, and abuse. Such experiences, she goes on to clarify, have been identified by women activists as: 'physical and sexual violence; lack of voice or political power; being neglected or ignored; being controlled; and being viewed as objects or property' (62).
17. Health concerns have been formulated not only with regard to consumers of factory-farmed animal products, but for workers in factory farms, those who live near such farms, as well as the broader human community. Identified concerns for human health from factory farming include in particular: (a) the loss of effective antibiotics (the widespread use of antibiotics in factory farming has led to antibiotic-resistant bacteria presenting not only the human gut but in wild animals) (Akhtar 2012; Anomaly 2014); (b) the deleterious effects of factory farming on air, water and biodiversity as well as their contributions to greenhouse gas emissions (Steinfeld et al. 2006), with consequent negative impacts on the health of human communities (Akhtar 2012; Donham et al. 2007; Greger and Koneswaran 2010; Ilea 2009; Radon et al. 2007).
18. For many animal rights activists, taking the strongest ethical view is the only stance that counts. Pallotta (2005, 84) argues that for many animal rights activists, being 'morally consistent' is of great concern. She cites one activist, Amber, for instance, who argues that 'if you're into the animal rights movement and you're not vegan, you're a total hypocrite' (83).

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

 AQ6

## References

- Akhtar, Aysha. 2012. *Animals and Public Health*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.  AQ7
- Animals Australia. 2012. "Make It Possible." Video File and Transcript. [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fM6V6lq\\_p0o](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fM6V6lq_p0o)  AQ8
- Anomaly, Jonathan. 2014. "What's Wrong with Factory Farming?" *Public Health Ethics*. doi:10.1093/phe/phu001.
- Bobel, Chris. 2007. "'I'm Not an Activist, though I've Done a Lot of It': Doing Activism, Being Activist and the 'Perfect Standard' in a Contemporary Movement" *Social Movement Studies* 6 (2): 147–159. doi:10.1080/14742830701497277.  AQ9

- Chatterton, Paul, and Jenny Pickerill. 2010. "Everyday Activism and Transitions towards Post-Capitalist Worlds." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35 (4): 475–490. doi:10.1111/j.1475-5661.2010.00396.x.
- Cherry, Elizabeth. 2006. "Veganism as a Cultural Movement: A Relational Approach." *Social Movement Studies* 5 (2): 155–170. doi:10.1080/14742830600807543.
- Clark, Chris. 2013. "Animals Australia under the Microscope." *ABC Landline*, June 16. <http://www.abc.net.au/landline/content/2013/s3782456.htm>.
- Dickinson, Roger A., and Mary L. Carsky. 2005. "The Consumer as Economic Voter." In *The Ethical Consumer*, edited by Rob Harrison, Terry Newholm, and Deirdre Shaw, 25–36. London: Sage.
- Donham, Kelley J., Steven Wing, David Osterberg, Jan L. Flora, Carol Hodne, Kendall M. Thu, and Peter S. Thorne. 2007. "Community Health and Socioeconomic Issues Surrounding Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 115 (2): 317–320.
- Driscoll, Janis Wiley. 1992. "Attitudes toward Animal Use." *Anthrozoos: A Multidisciplinary Journal of the Interactions of People & Animals* 5 (1): 32–39.
- Einwohner, Rachel L. 2002. "Bringing the Outsiders in: Opponents' Claims and the Construction of Animal Rights Activists' Identity." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 7 (3): 253–268.
- Gaarder, Emily. 2011. "Where the Boys Aren't: The Predominance of Women in Animal Rights Activism." *Feminist Formations* 23 (2): 54–76. doi:10.1353/ff.2011.0019.
- Gee, James Paul. 2010. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Glickman, Lawrence B. 2009. *Buying Power*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Greger, Michael, and Gowri Koneswaran. 2010. "The Public Health Impacts of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations on Local Communities." *Family and Community Health* 33 (1): 373–382.
- Hawkins, Richard A. 2010. "Boycotts, Buycotts and Consumer Activism in a Global Context: An Overview." *Management & Organization History* 5 (2): 123–143. doi:10.1177/1744935910361644.
- Heath, Joseph, and Andrew Potter. 2004. *Nation of Rebels: Why Counterculture Became Consumer Culture*. New York: Harper.
- Hilton, Matthew. 2009. *Prosperity for All: Consumer Activism in an Era of Globalization*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Horton, Dave. 2003. "Green Distinctions: The Performance of Identity among Environmental Activists." *The Sociological Review* 51 (Issue supplement s2): 63–77. doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00451.x.
- Ilea, Ramona Christina. 2009. "Intensive Livestock Farming: Global Trends, Increased Environmental Concerns, and Ethical Solutions." *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 22 (2): 153–167. doi:10.1007/s10806-008-9136-3.
- Jacobsson, Kerstin, and Jonas Lindblom. 2012. "Moral Reflexivity and Dramaturgical Action in Social Movement Activism: The Case of the Plowshares and Animal Rights Sweden." *Social Movement Studies* 11 (1): 41–60. doi:10.1080/14742837.2012.640529.
- Jasper, James M., and Dorothy Nelkin. 1992. *The Animal Rights Crusade: The Growth of a Moral Protest*. New York: Free Press.
- Jasper, James M., and Jane D. Poulsen. 1995. "Recruiting Strangers and Friends: Moral Shocks and Social Networks in Animal Rights and Anti-Nuclear Protests." *Social Problems* 42 (4): 493–512.
- Johnston, Hank, Enrique Laraña, and Joseph R. Gusfield. 1994. "Identities, Grievances, and New Social Movements." In *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield, 3–35. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Kruse, Corwin R. 1999. "Gender, Views of Nature, and Support for Animal Rights." *Society and Animals* 7 (3): 179–198.
- Kurzer, Paulette, and Alice Cooper. 2007. "Consumer Activism, EU Institutions and Global Markets: The Struggle over Biotech Foods." *Journal of Public Policy* 27 (2): 103–128. doi:10.1017/S0143814X07000657.
- Levinson, Mark. 2001. "Wishful Thinking." In *Can We Put an End to Sweatshops?*, edited by Archon Fung, Dara O'Rourke, and Charles Sabel, 54–58. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Littler, Jo. 2011. "What's Wrong with Ethical Consumption?" In *Ethical Consumption: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Tania Lewis and Emily Potter, 27–39. New York: Routledge.
- Lowe, Brian M., and Caryn F. Ginsberg. 2002. "Animal Rights as a Post-Citizenship Movement." *Society and Animals* 10 (2): 203–215.
- Maykut, Pamela S., and Richard E. Morehouse. 1994. *Beginning Qualitative Research: A Philosophic and Practical Guide*. London: Falmer Press.
- McAdam, Doug. 1994. "Culture and Social Movements." In *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield, 36–57. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1994. "A Strange Kind of Newness: What's 'New' in New Social Movements." In *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield, 101–132. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Melucci, Alberto. 2013. "The Process of Collective Identity." In *Social Movements and Culture*, edited by Hank Johnston and Bert Klandermans, 73–109. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.
- Mummery, Jane, Debbie Rodan, Katrina Ironside, and Marnie Nolton. 2014. "Mediating Legal Reform: Animal Law, Livestock Welfare and Public Pressure." In *Refereed Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Communication Association Conference: The Digital and the Social: Communication for Inclusion and Exchange*, edited by Diana Bossio. <http://www.anzca.net/conferences/past-conferences/2014-conf.html>.

- Pallotta, Nicole Renee. 2005. "Becoming an Animal Rights Activist: An Exploration of Culture, Socialization, and Identity Transformation." PhD diss., University of Georgia.
- Peek, Charles W., Nancy J. Bell, and Charlotte C. Dunham. 1996. "Gender, Gender Ideology, and Animal Rights Advocacy." *Gender & Society* 10 (4): 464–478.
- 5 Poletta, Francesca, and James M. Jasper. 2001. "Collective Identity and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 283–305.
- Radon, Katja, Anja Schulze, Vera Ehrenstein, Rob T. van Strien, Georg Praml, and Dennis Nowak. 2007. "Environmental Exposure to Confined Animal Feeding Operations and Respiratory Health of Neighboring Residents." *Epidemiology* 18 (3): 300–308.
- 10 Rodan, Debbie, and Jane Mummary. 2014a. "Platforms and Activism: Sharing 'My Make It Possible Story' Narratives." In *Refereed Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Communication Association Conference: The Digital and the Social: Communication for Inclusion and Exchange*, edited by Diana Bossio. <http://www.anzca.net/conferences/past-conferences/2014-conf.html>.
- Rodan, Debbie, and Jane Mummary. 2014b. "The 'Make It Possible' Multi-Media Campaign: Generating a New 'Everyday' in Animal Welfare." *Media International Australia* 153: 78–87.
- 15 Ruiz-Junco, Natalia. 2011. "Losing Neutrality in Your Everyday Life: Framing Experience and Activist Identity Construction in the Spanish Environmental Movement." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 40 (6): 713–733.
- Sebo, Jeff. 2015. "Intersectional Food Activism." *Conference Paper, 2015 Food Ethics Workshop*. University of Vermont. <http://www.uvm.edu/foodsystems/documents/Sebo-IntersectionalFoodActivism.pdf>.
- 20 Shaw, Deirdre, Terry Newholm, and Roger A. Dickinson. 2006. "Consumption as Voting: An Exploration of Consumer Empowerment." *European Journal of Marketing* 40 (9/10): 1049–1067. doi:10.1108/03090560610681005.
- Steinfeld, Henning, Pierre Gerber, Tom Wassenaar, Vincent Castel, Mauricio Rosales, and Cees de Haan. 2006. *Livestock's Long Shadow – Environmental Issues and Options*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.